

Appl. No. 10/619,665
Amdt. Dated: October 26, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 26, 2005

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in the Application. Claims 1-12 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, and 9-12 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found in the entire specification. In particular, support may be found on pages 5, 9, and 10. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Choi et al. U.S. Publication No. 2002/0085169 A1 (hereinafter "Choi") Choi for the reasons stated on pages 2-4 of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; and that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970).

Claim 1 has been amended in a non-narrowing manner to recite "a TFT array panel including a plurality of first display signal lines, a plurality of second display signal lines crossing the first display signal lines, a plurality of switching elements connected to the first display signal lines and the second display signal lines, and a plurality of pixel electrodes connected to the switching elements; *an inspection line formed on the TFT array panel* for transmitting a test signal to the second display signal lines, and a *test pad formed on the TFT array panel and connected to the inspection line*, for receiving the test signal, wherein the inspection line is separated from the first and second display signal lines, the switching elements, and the pixel electrodes."

Appl. No. 10/619,665
Amdt. Dated: October 26, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 26, 2005

Support for these amendments may be found, e.g., on page 10, lines 5-7 of the Applicant's Specification, which states "the driving signal lines 323, the lead lines 321, the connecting lines 541, the VI inspection lines 125, and the test pads 126 are provided on the TFT panel 100" and lines 20-21, which states "the inspection lines 125, the connecting lines 541, and the lead lines 321 *are formed on an insulating substrate 110*". The insulating substrate 110, in turn, is provided on the TFT panel 100 of the assembly 300.

By contrast, Choi teaches that a wiring unit for testing defects whereby "wiring is formed in a separated zigzag connection wiring 30b and then, connected to a first line D₁ of data odd pad 17a and a first line D₂ of a data even pad 17b in series" (page 2, paragraph 31). Choi is devoid of teaching the formation of the wiring (inspection lines) on the TFT panel, but rather it teaches that the wiring is connected to data lines (FIGs. 3A-3B). Moreover, Choi is silent as to where the pads are formed, as well as the test equipment used.

Therefore, Choi fails to teach or make obvious the features "*an inspection line formed on the TFT array panel* for transmitting a test signal to the second display signal lines, and *a test pad formed on the TFT array panel and connected to the inspection line*" as recited in Applicant's claim 1. Accordingly, Choi does not render obvious Applicant's claim 1. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection. Claims 2-12 depend from what should be an allowable claim 1. For at least this reason, the Applicant submits that claims 2-12 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

Appl. No. 10/619,665
Amdt. Dated: October 26, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 26, 2005

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicant's attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: Marisa J. Dubuc
Marisa J. Dubuc
Registration No. 46,673
Confirmation No. 7173
Cantor Colburn LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
PTO Customer No. 23413
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Facsimile: (860) 286-0115

Date: October 26, 2005